```
Pages 1-14
 1
                      UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
                    NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
 2
                         SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION
 3
 4
    JANE DOE,
                                       Case No. 21-cv-03943-WHO
 5
                Plaintiff,
                                      San Francisco, California
                                       Wednesday, May 3, 2023
 6
         v.
                                       ZOOM WEBINAR PROCEEDINGS
 7
   ROBLOX CORPORATION,
 8
                Defendant.
9
10
                          TRANSCRIPT OF HEARING
11
                 BEFORE THE HONORABLE WILLIAM H. ORRICK
12
                   UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT JUDGE
13
   APPEARANCES: (Via Zoom Webinar)
14
   For Plaintiff:
15
                                 YAMAN SALAHI, ESQ.
                                 Edelson PC
                                 150 California Street, 18th Floor
16
                                 San Francisco, California 94111
17
                                 (415) 212-9300
                                 MARK S. REICH, ESQ.
18
                                 Levi & Korsinsky LLP
                                 55 Broadway
19
                                 4th Floor, Suite 427
2.0
                                 New York, New York 10006
                                 (212) 363-7500
2.1
   For Defendant:
                                 ANTHONY J. WEIBELL, ESQ.
                                 Wilson Sonsini Goodrich & Rosati
22
                                 Professional Corporation
23
                                 650 Page Mill Road
                                 Palo Alto, California 94304-1050
24
25
   Proceedings recorded by electronic sound recording; transcript
   produced by transcription service.
```

APPEARANCES: (Cont'd.) Transcription Service: Peggy Schuerger Ad Hoc Reporting 2220 Otay Lakes Road, Suite 502-85 Chula Vista, California 91915 (619) 236-9325

3 SAN FRANCISCO, CALIFORNIA WEDNESDAY, MAY 3, 2023 1:57 P.M. 1 2 --000--THE CLERK: All right. So this is Case Number 21-3943, 3 4 Doe v. Roblox Corporation. Counsel, if you would please state 5 your appearance for the record. 6 MR. SALAHI: Good afternoon, Your Honor. This is Yaman 7 Salahi of Edelson PC for Plaintiff. 8 MR. REICH: Good morning, Your Honor. Mark Reich with 9 Levi Korsinsky also on behalf of Plaintiff. 10 MR. WEIBELL: Hello, Your Honor. Tony Weibell for the Defendants Roblox. 11 12 THE COURT: Good afternoon to everybody. So I've got a 13 few questions for you, Mr. Salahi. First, the -- I need to know what your lodestar is and any expert fees or other expenses. 14 15 Those are things that are required in the application. So if you would submit a declaration within a week and provide that 16 17 information, that would be helpful. There's no valuation that's included of injunctive --18 19 injunctive relief if there is any valuation to be had. And so --20 so I need all of those things. 21 With respect to the Short Form Notice, it's also going to be important to include the settlement value as well as the 22 23 amount sought in the Short Form Notice, not just 25 percent but 25

percent of what so that the class would know.

So those are some issues that I need, but I have some

24

25

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

4

questions for you. How many class members do you expect to request cash here? -- would be qualified and request cash?

MR. SALAHI: Thank you, Your Honor. So to address that directly, I just want to distinguish between people who might be eligible for the cash payments and people who might ultimately request it.

On the first question, we have a tentative sense. a relatively small proportion of the class, and that's because of the fact that the lawsuit here for class members was generally pretty small. The vast majority of users spent very small amounts of Robux on the items that were then moderated from the accounts. Based on the preliminary information that Mr. Weibell has provided us -- which is of course tentative until we've gone through the entire process -- we estimate there's likely somewhere around ten thousand class members who might meet the eligibility requirements based solely on the number of -- there's a new (indiscernible), but if you look on a per-account basis -- and, Mr. Weibell can correct me if I'm wrong -- it's slightly under ten thousand that meets the eligibility threshold standing alone. But there is also the option that individuals who possess more than one Robux account can attempt to abrogate those claims, so losses from multiple accounts. And if they then meet the threshold, that may result in a higher number. But based on what we know about the class so far, it's unlikely that that would be a large number of individuals, at least wouldn't significantly increase the number

of class members who ultimately aren't eligible for a cash payment.

In terms of -- I apologize, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Go ahead.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

25

MR. SALAHI: We're aiming for the largest percentage possible of those who are eligible to request cash to request cash, and the steps that we've taken to ensure that are a reminder notice to just that subset of class members beyond the original notice to remind them before the cash claim deadline that they have the opportunity. But the way that it is structured, class members have a very favorable exchange rate if they prefer to receive -- if you're eligible for cash payments but prefer to receive the Robux instead, you actually get a better deal at the end of the day if you select the Robux option than the cash option because the exchange rate that's used for purposes of getting relief from Robux here is more favorable than what you'd get on the open market in all instances but -- but one, which is if you were to buy a package of Robux at the \$100 amount. In that case, the exchange rate is very slightly more favorable on the open market and that's because there's a difference between one cent per Robux versus .9999 cents per Robux, essentially.

THE COURT: Okay. So the first tranche of cash that's actually paid in is \$3 million. Do you expect any of this \$7 million that remains to be paid in?

MR. SALAHI: We don't know at this stage. So, Your

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Honor, when we negotiated, that's when we originally asked for full funding at the outset, and Roblox's position was no funding till after final approval. We arrived at the \$3 million number as a compromise but also to take into account that there are administrative difficulties and inefficiencies associated with transferring money in and out. For example, if the fund is overfunded and then it turns out that there's more money in the fund than is going to be distributed as cash, that results in transactions back and forth which means Roblox and Settlement Fund, so it's more efficient for us to understand fully at the end of the final approval of claims process what -- what monetary amount actually needs to be funded proactively into the fund versus distributed directly into the Roblox accounts. The distribution of Roblox accounts are going to be handled by Roblox itself rather than the Settlement Administrator. So there's not a need for that -- for that fund to go back and forth between dollars and Robux, as it were.

THE COURT: Well, given what you've said about how many people might qualify for cash payments and what you're seeking for attorneys' fees and what expenses there may be, can you give me any sort of an estimate as to any of the \$7 million that would be paid out in cash as opposed to Robux?

MR. SALAHI: Yeah. Unfortunately, Your Honor, I can't sitting here today. I think once we go through the claims process, we'll have that information for you. The reason that I

can't is because although we think less than ten percent of the class likely have damages exceeding the \$10 threshold, they are likely disproportionate spenders in the class as well, so it's hard for me sitting here today -- Mr. Weibell may have more information on that. But it's possible that even though those are a relatively small percentage of the class, in the aggregate they're going to just actually come out to a higher dollar amount. So I unfortunately don't have that information for you.

THE COURT: Mr. Weibell, do you have anything to add at this point?

MR. WEIBELL: Yeah, I can. So as was said, you know, we estimate about 10- to 20,000 that might be eligible. Twenty thousand would be eligible if there were no attorneys' fees awarded, of course, but we have to pay attorneys' fees here. And so -- so there's going to be a very small amount.

But the graph looks -- it's a very exponential-looking graph; in other words, most class members have spent next to -- I think the average spend was less than \$1.50 on moderated items. And so what you have is you'll have a few individuals -- and when I say "few," a relatively few -- you know, a few thousand maybe -- that will have very high amounts. And if they choose to take cash over Robux, that will really change what the numbers might look like, and we just don't know which of those individuals are going to choose cash versus Robux. So that's why it's so difficult to predict what's going to happen till we actually get the claims in.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

8

THE COURT: Okay. So, Mr. Salahi, aren't the people who have closed are in inactive accounts, aren't they part of the class?

MR. SALAHI: Yes, Your Honor. There's nothing precluding them from membership in the class.

THE COURT: Okay. And are they -- are they also entitled to recovery?

MR. SALAHI: That's correct, Your Honor. I think the mechanism of recovery is going to depend. So sitting here today, I don't know the number of class members who would fall in that -in that sub-category -- would not expect it to be high. understanding from our engagement with Mr. Weibell is that the typical pattern is that a person with young children is often seasonal activity, sometimes correlating through the school year and when there are breaks. And so although an account may not be active for some short period of time, it tends to get reactivated around the holidays or in the summer. And so on -- the number of accounts that have actually been closed and terminated, we do not expect to be a substantial number at all. But that is an issue that is on our radar. And to the extent that there are individuals who can't recover Robux because their accounts are closed, I think that's an issue that will have to be revisited once we understand what that universe looks like.

Right now, the way that the settlement is structured is that if there are accounts that -- to which a refund of Robux

that now, I do think this is an issue that likely doesn't need to

be resolved until the attorneys' fees stage, how attorneys' fees

24

25

2.0

can be calculated in this case. But I actually think the more apt case here is the *In re Online DVD Rental Antitrust Litigation*. And I say that conceding that this virtual world and virtual economies is new. It's not something that Congress really anticipated when CAFA was passed. It's not something that fits within all fours of any of the examples that I'm aware of in the Ninth Circuit.

That said, I do think that the Online DVD Rental Antitrust case provides a useful analog because one of the things that the court considered there was whether or not \$12 gift cards to Walmart shouldn't be treated as coupons. And the court looked at the fact that what Congress was concerned with when it passed this provision of CAFA were settlements where you truly got a coupon, so you got a dollar, then you had to spend ten dollars plus (indiscernible) out of pocket to be able to actually benefit from that relief.

Here, the Roblox online store -- first, class members purchased the Robux so they could spend it in that store. And so what we have done to the settlement for those who have losses below ten dollars is restore that ability to them -- almost 50 percent of that ability to them to be able to redeem those Robux in the online store, and we've submitted information -- and I'm happy to supplement this in a later filing with the Court -- with like about the nature of the items that are available in the store. The vast majority of items in the Roblox Avatar Shop are

very cheap. We're talking about 5, 10, 15, 20 Robux. And here, the average is probably over a hundred, so there are numerous items that the class members can use to purchase virtual items, just the same as they would have at the outset of the case had they not spent their Robux on items that Roblox later took away from them without informing them.

So we think -- and we'll expound on this on our subsequent filings, with the Court's permission -- but we think that this actually is not -- while there are some fact features that may warrant looking at this carefully to see whether it is a coupon settlement, ultimately, taking into consideration that this is a virtual world and a virtual economy and where class members got at the outset and what they locked at the outset was the same virtual currency, means that this would be looked at very differently from the normal coupon case because people will be able to spend these Robux on the Roblox store without spending additional money out of pocket to redeem that value.

THE COURT: Okay. Well, so I will give you the opportunity to brief that and persuade me otherwise. I just want you to know where -- where you're starting from with me and the way that I'm looking at this.

MR. SALAHI: Thank you, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Okay. And then, finally, the -- I'll just tell you that the opt-out and exclusion language which you used is overly burdensome and we'll need to revise it. And I think as

long as we've got a Word version of things, we can do that here.

But basically leave -- the parties, once they settle, often want

to include more barriers to opposition than I like to have for

them, and so it's -- those things need to be fixed.

So the -- so what I'd like you to do, Mr. Salahi, is submit the declaration in a week with the information that is required by our rules with respect to approval of class certification. And then I'll get an order out as soon as I can after that.

MR. SALAHI: Thank you, Your Honor. And just to confirm, so our three pieces of information were counsel's lodestar, any costs or expenses that counsel might seek to recoup at the end of the case, and a valuation of injunctive relief.

THE COURT: Yes. Yeah. That's right. And I do want the Short Form to include both the settlement value and the amount sought, and I'll put that in the minute order coming out of this so that it's appropriately clear about what I need.

MR. SALAHI: Thank you. And, Your Honor, would the Court like us to submit the Word version of the notices for purposes of the opt-out inclusion issue, or is that something that you just want for a minute order?

THE COURT: Yeah -- no, just -- you can see that -- I'll tell you that in the minute order, but that's what I'm going to be -- I'm going to be looking for things that I can manipulate in order to make sure that once it goes out, we've got a -- we've got

something that's going to work. So we should have the order and -- and those -- the notices in the order. Okay?

MR. WEIBELL: Your Honor, will we have an opportunity to address Your Honor's concerns about the opt-out provisions? I know -- we were crafting those very carefully to make sure people could opt out. At the same time, there were some concerns we did have and we wanted to make sure that if -- if there are going to be changes to that, that we do have an opportunity to discuss those with -- with Your Honor so that you understood at least where we were coming from.

THE COURT: Well, the short answer is I love hearing people's concerns. But in every class action -- and it will include this one -- I'm not -- this is really my -- my bailiwick and not the parties with respect to how somebody can opt out. And so I'm not -- I'm not going to have any briefing on it, Mr. Weibell, so -- but thank you.

MR. WEIBELL: All right. Thank you, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Okay.

MR. WEIBELL: I do -- yeah. One of the concerns we were trying to address is more recent phenomena where you balance -- you want to make it easy for the individual to opt out, but you -- but what you don't want is for -- there -- these outfits out there that will try and collect en masse, and using electronic means that can get very easily -- even potential names of class members and they can put into a form that looks like a class member has